THE QUALITY OF INDONESIAN - ENGLISH TRANSLATION BY ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS OF HIGHER LEARNING INSTITUTIONS IN MAKASSAR

Mansur Akil
Universitas Negeri Makassar

1. Introduction

The vital role of translation in the national development, the process of technological transfer, and international contact has been a national acknowledgement (Alisyahbana, 1990; Simatupang, 1990; and Omar, 1996). But, the fact that the scarcity of qualified translator while it is badly needed and the poor quality of translation performance especially from Indonesian into English made by the English department students and graduates as usually spotted, while they have attended translation course, has left a wide-yawning gap to cover.

Why is the quality of the students' translations poor and how can it be improved? This is the main question that has made the writer, as a teacher of English, feel obliged and think it necessary to conduct a research on translation from Indonesian into English.

Based on the above considerations, the writer realizes that to describe why the students' translations have low quality and to arrange improvement action, there must be a comprehensive picture of the students' translations. Therefore, the first thing to know is the objective condition of the students' performance in translating as reflected in their translation works. For that reason, this research focused on the question, "How is the translation quality of made by English department students of Higher Learning Institutions in Makassar?" Therefore, for the sake of clarity and better understanding, in the ensuing, the above main question is the key question to be further investigated.

2. Literature Review

There are nine previous studies related to translation elaborated in the earlier part of this research: (1) Rahman (1979) concluded that the students did very poor translation due to the lack of necessary translation skills; (2) Nasaruddin (1987). found out that the student's difficulty in translating was caused by low mastery of vocabulary, unsatisfactory knowledge of translation theory, incompleteness of the target language control, and insufficiency of translation practice; (3) Wehantouw (1988) revealed some problems encountered by the students in translating Indonesian into English such as word order, article, poor construction, word choice, missing verb, etc., errors discussed were grammatical errors, no

discussion about errors related to the message rendering; (4). Asriani (1991) found out that students faced difficulty in (1) translating two-word verb (phrase level), (2) using good structure, finding appropriate word and catching the message of the context (sentence level), (3) catching the content of the paragraph (paragraph level), and (4) avoiding word-to-word translation; (5) Hertanto (1994) concluded that (1) the types of lexical problems faced by the translation learners were special terms, special expression, idiom, and content words, and (2) the types of grammatical problems faced by the translation learners were functions words, morphology, and syntax, (3) some of the lexical and grammatical errors caused local and global problems; (6) Huda (1995) found that (1) the type of lexical problems faced by the learners were content word and special term, (2) the type of grammatical problems faced by the learners were morphology, syntax, function word, and cohesiveness, (3) all the above problems caused either local or global problems; (7) Amrin (1997) revealed that the translation errors made by students were mostly in the form of modification of meaning (44.22%) and deviation of meaning (34 %); (8) Ramayanty (2005) revealed that there were 8 (eight) grammatical errors made by the transtool, they were tenses (18.75%), pronouns (11.25%), agreement (12.5%), countable and uncountable noun (22,5%), passive voice (6,25%), imperative (3,75%), article (20 %), and parallelism (5%).; and the last (9) Johan (2006) revealed that students faced lexical difficulties (word identification, meaning identification, and idiom) and grammatical difficulties in the forms of noun phrase patterns, subject-predicate construction (agreement), participial phrases, verb patterns, and tenses.

Looking at the nature of the research findings and conclusions elaborated in the eight studies above, the writer concludes that the current research is worthy of conducting. Since, the current research analyzes the students' Indonesian-English translation quality aspects mentioned in the research questions which have not been touched at all or only a very little bit in the previous studies above. So, this study will enrich the previous studies in many respects such as theory, methodology, findings, and recommendation.

The concept of translation referred to in this research is the one proposed by Nida and Taber (1974:12), Newmark (1982) and Sadtono (1985) which reads translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in term of meaning and second in terms of style. In this definition there are three implied conditions should be met in order to produce a good translation, namely accuracy, clarity, and naturalness. In addition to the three key words, the word equivalent is also important. There are three kinds of equivalence should be paid attention to when

translating, namely grammatical equivalence, lexical equivalence, and dynamic equivalence.

To have a good translation there are seven steps we have to go through, they are (1) Tuning, (2) Analysis (3) Understanding; (4) Terminology. (5) Restructuring. (6) Checking, and (7) Discussion (Baker 2001; Bell, 1991).

In translating many aspects interact: translator, text which cover language, subject matter, and culture, and target reader. Interaction among these aspects will determine the quality of the translation undertaken (Omar.

There are many types of translation discussed by different experts, but when having a close look at them, we can put them in only two types, namely (1) total (normal) translation, where all aspects of meaning are translated, with predominantly obligatory shifts occur and (2) adaptive translation, where there is an adaptation in the text character, locally or globally.

Translation may demonstrate five kinds of error, (Gentile, 1996) namely: inversion of meaning- the expression of meaning of the source language text in another way round. In this case, the target language's intention contradicts with that of source language-the addition of meaning-the inclusion of intentions or ideas which are not mentioned or implied in the source language. In the other word, the intention of the source language is broadened; the omission of meaning- the exclusion of idea or ideas of the source language in the target language, so that the intention of the source language is not completely transferred. The deviation of meaning- the diversion of the intention of the source language to other notions while modification of meaning-the expression of the intention of the source language into an unclear form (Gentzler, 1993). Any error above will reflect either linguistic effect (does the error affect a main or secondary part of the sentence, e.g. the subject or modifier?); semantic effect (does the error affect the major or minor element, e.g. the main argument, or an example?); or pragmatic effect (does the error affect the intention in a significant or a negligible way, e.g. the general persuasive purpose or the tone of voice?. Effect of errors on the whole text e.g. typographic error can change the meaning of a word and thereby distort the whole text.

The quality of a translation as suggested by Sager (1983), Johan (2004), and Ma'mur (2005) is determined by: (1) how accurate is it or is it grammatically correct?; (2) how clear is it or is it semantically clear?; and (3) how natural is it or is it pragmatically accepted?.

The gists of findings and pertinent ideas concerning translation above, governs the writer's paradigm in looking at the world of translation. So any talk on translation in this research refers to the concepts above.

3. Research Method

The research employs descriptive method and is descriptive-analytic in objective, which involves collecting data in order to answer the research questions formulated in the problem statement. As a descriptive study, it neither treats the subject nor manipulates them because its main purpose is to uncover the quality of the Indonesian-English translation made by the English departments students of higher learning institutions in Makassar. In addition, no verification of a certain theory is done through testing a hypothesis, the characteristics of this study are the absence of control over what, and only measure what already exists, and it determines and reports the way things are. But, since it is descriptive-analytic in objective, the research also conducts an in depth analysis to the described data to find out patterns or consistencies and the possible logical/theoretical relationship among the variables under study.

The population of this research are the Indonesian-English translations made by English Department students of higher learning institutions (hereafter, institution) in Makassar (UNHAS, UNM, UMI, UNISMUH, IAIN, Universitas SATRIA, Universitas 45, ABA UMI, and ABA ATMAJAYA). The target population subjects were all students majoring in English in both state and institutions in Makassar totaling about 3750. While the accessible population subjects only the students who went to the five selected institutions, namely UNHAS, UNM, UMI, UNISMUH, and ABA ATMAJAYA, about 2646.

This research applied two-staged sampling procedure by combining purposive and random sampling method. Purposive sampling was used to determine the higher learning institutions and semester of the students, the criteria for this was the well established higher learning institutions of both non-education and education based and the fifth semester up or the students who had completed at least 80 credits (sks) and had attended translation class at least Translation I or Theory of Translation Class. The number of students meeting the requirements out of the 2646 was about 897. This was randomly sampled. The sample size was based on Morgan table.

Through the above procedure, five institutions were taken as samples, two state universities and two non-state universities and one college. The two universities were UNHAS representing the non-education-based institutions and UNM representing the education-based, two non-state universities, namely UMI representing the non-education-

based and UNISMUH representing the education-based and one college, namely ABA Atmajaya representing the neutral one or general English. The ideal sample subject size of that number of population was 269. Since each subject was required to translate three Indonesian SL-Texts, then the ideal sample should have been 807 English TL-Texts. But, during the data collection, only 207 subjects came. Of those 207 subjects only 183 (61 male and 122 female) completed the work. So, after sorting the collected data only 549 (183 X 3) TL-Texts were worthy of analysis.

4. Research Findings and Discussions

The findings of the quality of students translation will cover five higher institutions in Makassar. The first is the quality of translations made by the English department students of UMI are presented in table 1 below.

The quality aspects of Indonesian-English translations made by UMI students are presented in table 1.below

Table 1 Translation Quality of UMI Students

Translation Quality		Frequency			Σ	%
		A	B	C		
1. Accuracy	x	16	9	10	35	3.3
2. Clarity	x	8	2	6	32	3.0
	x	34	7	32	73	6.9
3.Naturalness	x	8	2	4	14	1.3
Σ		74	22	58	154	14,5
Standard of Quality		408	176	460	1064	14.5/100 x 4 =0.58
Level of Quality (%)		7	2.1	5.4	14.5	

*Note: Standard of quality of text A is 102 x 4 , text B is 49 x 4,
text C is 115 x 4 or 266 x 4 for the whole (W)

The table shows that the level of quality of the TL texts (students' translation) is very

5

poor. The level of quality of TL-text A when all aspects (accuracy, clarity, and naturalness) are combined is only 7 %, TL-text B is only 2.1%, and TL-text C is only 5.4 %, and when putting them together (the whole text), is only 14.5%. This means that when the three TL-Texts graded based on the aforementioned grading system of translation proposed here (0 -- 4 scale), the grade is less than I (one), since 25% equals to I (one), whereas, the level of the quality of that is only 14.5 %. So, the grade of the TL-texts made by UMI students is 14.5/100 x 4 = 0.58

 The second is the quality aspects of the Indonesian-English translations made by the English department students of ABA Atmajaya are presented in table 2 below.

Table 2 Translation Quality of ABA Students

Translation Quality		Frequency			Σ	%
		A	B	C		
1. Accuracy	x	39	24	49	112	3.9
2. Clarity	x	28	5	41	148	5.2
	x	68	32	67	167	5.9
3.Naturalness	x	28	5	32	65	2.3
Σ		191	71	230	492	17.3
Standard of Quality		868	728	1248	2844	17.3/100 x 4 = 0.69
Level of Quality (%)		6.7	2.5	8.1	17.3	

 *Note: Standard of quality of text A is 217x 4 , text B is 182 x 4, text C is 312 x 4 or 711 x 4 for the whole (W)

 The table shows that the level of quality of the TL texts (students' translation) is very poor. The level of quality of TL-text A when all aspects are combined is only 6.7 %, TL-text B is only 2.5%, and TL-text C is only 8.0 %, and when putting them together (the

whole text), is only 17.2 %. This means that when the three TL-Texts graded based on the aforementioned grading system of translation, proposed here (0 -- 4 scale), the grade is less than I (one), since 25 % equals to I (one), whereas, the level of the quality of that is only 17.3 %. So, the grade of the TL-text of ABA is 17.3/100 x 4 = 0.69. Even if this quality is poor, this is the highest grade among the non-state higher learning institutions involved in this study.

The third is that the quality aspects of the Indonesian-English translations made by the English department students of UNHAS are presented in table 3 below

Table 3 Translation Quality of UNHAS Students

Translation Quality		Frequency			Σ	%
		A	B	C		
1. Accuracy	x	30	16	56	102	4.8
2. Clarity	x	17	2	51	140	6.6
	x	64	21	55	140	6.6
3.Naturalness	x	17	2	46	65	3
Σ		145	43	259	447	21
Standard of Quality		716	476	928	2120	21/100 x 4 = 0.84
Level of Quality (%)		6.8	2	12.2	21	

*Note: Standard of quality of text A is 179 x 4 , text B is 119 x 4, text C is 232 x 4 or 530 x 4 for the whole (W)

The table shows that the level of quality of the TL texts (students' translation) is very poor. The level of quality of TL-text A when all aspects are combined is only 6.8 %, TL-text B is only 2%, and TL-text C is only 12.2 %, and when putting them together (the whole text), is only 21 %. This means that when the three TL-Texts graded based on the aforementioned grading system of translation proposed here (0 -- 4 scale), the grade is less than I (one), since 25 % equals to I (one), whereas, the level of the quality of that is only 21 %. So, the grade of the TL-text quality of UNHAS students is 21/100 x 4 = 0.84

The fourth is that the quality aspects of the Indonesian-English translations made by the English department students of UNISMUH are presented in table 4 below.

Table 4 Translation Quality of UNISMUH Students

Translation Quality		Frequency			Σ	%
		A	B	C		
1. Accuracy	x	15	5	22	42	1.3
2. Clarity	x	12	-	12	48	1.5
	x	15	6	28	49	1.6
3.Naturalness	x	12	-	7	19	0.6
Σ		66	11	81	158	5
Standard of Quality		932	756	1368	3056	5.17/100 x 4 =0.20
Level of Quality (%)		2.16	0.36	2.65	5.17	

*Note: Standard of quality of text A is 233 x 4 , text B is 189 x 4,
text C is 342 x 4 or 764 x 4 for the whole (W)

The table shows that the level of quality of the TL texts (students' translation) is very poor. The level of quality of TL-text A when all aspects are combined is only 2 %, TL-text B is only 0.4%, and TL-text C is only 2.6 %, and when putting them together (the whole

text), is only 5 %. This means that when the three TL-Texts made by the students graded based on the aforementioned grading system of translation proposed here (0 -- 4 scale), the grade is less than I (one), since 25 % equals to I (one), whereas, the level of the quality of that is only 5 %. So, the grade of the TL-text is 5/100 x 4 = 0.2. This means that almost all TL-texts made by the students of English department of UNISMUH were blank.

The fifth is the quality aspects of the Indonesian-English translations made by the English department students of UNM are presented in table 5 below.

Table 5 Translation Quality of UNM Students

Translation Quality		Frequency			Σ	%
		A	B	C		
1. Accuracy	x	79	48	127	254	5.3
2. Clarity	x	49	25	127	402	8.5
	x	135	36	126	297	6.3
3.Naturalness	x	49	25	114	188	3.9
Σ		361	159	621	1141	24
Standard of Quality		1440	1164	2136	4740	24/100 x 4 = 0.96
Level of Quality (%)		7.6	3.3	13.1	24	

*Note: Standard of quality of text A is 360 x 4 , text B is 291 x 4, text C is 534 x 4 or 1185 x 4 for the whole (W)

The table shows that the level of quality of the TL texts (students' translation) is very poor. The level of quality of TL-text A when all aspects are combined is only 7,6 %, TL-text B is only 3.3%, and TL-text C is only 13.1 %, and when putting them together (the whole text), is only 24 %. This means that when the three TL-Texts graded based on the

aforementioned grading system of translation proposed here (0 -- 4 scale), the grade is less than I (one), since 25 % equals to I (one), whereas, the level of the quality of that is only 24 %. So, the grade of the TL-text is 24/100 x 4 = 0.96.

Based on the findings above, the discussion will be elaborated based on the quality aspects of Indonesian-English translation made by students from state institution and the quality aspects made by non-state institution students.

The quality aspects of the Indonesian-English translations made by the English department students of the state institution are presented in table 6 below.

Table 6 Translation Quality of State Institutions

Translation Quality		Frequency			Σ	%
		A	B	C		
1. Accuracy	x	1 09	6 4	1 83	35 6	22.4
2. Clarity	x	6 6	2 7	1 78	54 2	34.1
	x	1 99	5 7	1 81	43 7	27.5
3.Naturaln ess	x	6 6	2 7	1 60	25 3	16
Σ		5 06	2 02	8 80	15 88	100
Standard of Quality		2 156	1 640	3 064	68 60	23.1/100 x 4 = 0.92
Level of Quality (%)		7 .4	2 .9	1 2.8	23 .1	

*Note: Standard of quality of text A is 539 x 4 , text B is 410 x 4,
text C is 766x 4 or 1715x 4 for the whole (W)

The table shows that the level of quality of the TL texts (students' translation) is very poor. The level of quality of TL-text A when all aspects are combined is only 7,4%, TL-text B is only 2.9%, and TL-text C is only 12.8 %, and when putting them together (the whole text), is only 23.1 %. This means that when the three TL-Texts graded based on the

aforementioned grading system of translation proposed here (0 -- 4 scale), the grade is less than I (one), since 25 % equals to I (one), whereas, the level of the quality of that is only 23.1 %. So, the grade of the TL-text quality is 23.1/100 x 4 = 0.92.

The quality aspects of the Indonesian-English translations made by the English department students of the Non-State Institutions are presented in table 7 below.

Table 7 Translation Quality of the Non-State Institutions

Translation Quality		Frequency			Σ	%
		A	B	C		
1. Accuracy	x	70	38	81	189	2.7
2. Clarity	x	48	7	59	228	3.3
	x	117	45	127	289	4.1
3.Naturalness	x	48	7	43	98	1.4
Σ		331	104	369	804	11.5
Standard of Quality		2208	1680	3076	6964	11.5/100x 4= 0.46
Level of Quality (%)		4.7	1.5	5.3	11.5	

*Note: Standard of quality of text A is 557 x 4 , text B is 420 x 4,
text C is 769 x 4 or 1746 x 4 for the whole (W)

The table shows that the level of quality of the TL texts (students' translation) is very poor. The level of quality of TL-text A when all aspects are combined is only 4.7 %, TL-

text B is only 1.5%, and TL-text C is only 5.3 %, and when putting them together (the whole text), is only 11.5 %. This means that when the three TL-Texts graded based on the aforementioned grading system of translation proposed here (0 -- 4 scale), the grade is less than I (one), since 25 % equals to I (one), whereas, the level of the quality of that is only 11.5 %. So, the grade of the TL-text is 11.5/100 x 4 = 0.46.

The quality of the students' translations, therefore, was very poor; the average grade was only 0.65 on (0-4) grading scale. All aspects (accuracy, clarity, and naturalness) were poor and varied by institutions, by status of institutions, and by semester: The translation among higher learning institutions were UNM 0.96, UNHAS 0,84, ABA ATMAJAYA 0.69, UMI 0.58, and UNISMUH 0.20, the state 0.92 and the non-state 0.46, semester V 0.46 and semester VII 0.89. This implies that different education and different experience the students got from their institutions will differentiate the quality of their translations. This is supported by the facts that the grades of certain institutions were higher than that of the other, the grades of state institutions were higher than that of the non-state institutions, the grades of the higher semester was better than that of the lower semester and, it is interesting to highlight here that ABA ATMAJAYA has the highest translation quality among the non-state higher institutions involved in this study, why? The answer to this question will vary according to the objective conditions in each higher learning institutions.

5. Conclusion

Above all, it can be concluded that the quality of the students' translation is the reflection of the English teaching quality in English departments of higher learning institutions in Makassar. In other words, the poor quality of the students' translations is the mirror of the poor quality of English teaching in all aspects. This is a pedagogic warning to all lecturers of English and English departments.

It is suggested to the lecturers of English, especially those teaching translation, to arrange remedial treatment based on the quality of the students' Indonesian-English translations revealed in this study. Besides that, students should read more about translation theory to improve their understanding of the nature and the process of translation and the quality of translation. Finally, for other interested researchers are suggested to conduct a study on it. There should be a gigantic translation project of books or documents on national values and national principles, culture, and beliefs that will inform outsiders the true Indonesia.

References

Alisyahbana, Sultan Takdir, 1990, *Terjemahan Besar-besaran Syarat Mutlak untuk Mengatasi Keterbelakangan*, Majalah Ilmu dan Budaya Tahun XII No.11, UNAS, Jakarta.

Amrin, 1997*, Errors in Translation from Indonesian into English Made by the Students of English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang*, Unpublished Thesis, FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang

Asriani, 1991, *Difficulties Faced by the students of English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang, in Translating from English into Indonesian*, Unpublished Thesis, FBS IKIP Ujung Pandang

Baker, Mona.2001. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Routledge, New York.

Bell. R.T, 1991, *Translation and Translating*, Longman, London and New York

Frawley, William. 1984. *Translation: Literary, Linguistic, and Philosophical Perspective*.University of Delaware Press, London.

Gentzler, Edwin.1993. *Cotemporary Translation Theories*. Routledge, London.

Gentile, Odolfo.1996. *Liaison Interpreting*. Melbourne University Press, Australia.

Hertanto, 1994 , *Lexical and Grammatical problems Encountered by the students in Tanslating from English into Indonesian*, Upublished thesis, IKIP Malang

Huda, 1995, *Errors Made by the Studentns in Tranalating English Text into Indonesian*, Unpublished thesis, Universitas Bung Hatta

Johan, A. Ghani.2004. *Reading and Translation:Pelajaran Membaca dan Menerjemahkan Bahasa Inggris*. Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta.

Ma'mur, Ilzamuddin.2005. *Some Potential Problem in Translating "Islamic Studies Text" from Indonesian into English.* Paper presented in International Conference on Translation, September 14-15, 2005, Solo, Indonesia

Nasaruddin, 1987, *Translation Difficulties Faced by the Five Semester students of English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang, in Translating from English into Indonesian*, Unpublished Thesis, FBS IKIP Ujung Pandang

Newmark, P.1982. *Approaches to Translation*. Pergamon Press Ltd., London.

Nida, A. Eugene. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. E.J. Brill, Leiden

Omar, Sheikh Al-Shabab. 1996. *Interpretation and The Language of Translation: Creativity and Conventions in Translation* .Janus Publishing Co. London.

Rachman, Asfah,1979, *The Necessity of Translation Skills for the Undergraduate Students of FKSS IKIP Ujung Pandang*, Unpublished Thesis, FKSS IKIP Ujung Pandang

Ramayanti, I. 2005. *Analisis Kesalahan Gramatika Terhadap Hasil Terjemahan Transtool sebagai Piranti Lunak Penerjemahan*. Paper presented in International Conference on Translation, September 14-15, 2005, Solo, Indonesia

Sadtono.1985. *Pedoman Penerjemahan.* Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Jakarta.

Sager, Juan, C. 1983, *Quality and Standards-the Evaluation of Translation*, in Catriona Pcken (Ed). The Translators' Handbook, London, Aslib.

Simatupang, S. 1990, *Translation and National Development.* Majalah Ilmu dan Budaya Tahun XII No.11, UNAS, Jakarta.

Suryawinata, Zuchridin. 1989. *Terjemahan: Pengantar Teori.dan Praktek*. Proyek Pengembangan Lembaga Pendidikan Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Jakarta.

Wehantow, O.J. 1988. *Translation: Its Role in Indonesia and the Theory and Practice of Teaching it to University Students*,(Unpublished Master Thesis) Ujungpandang : Fakultas Pascasarjana UNHAS.